

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 14 and 15. This sheet, which includes Figs. 14 and 15, replaces the original sheet including Figs.14 and 15.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

This communication is responsive to the Office Action mailed November 19, 2004.

Drawing Amendments

A substitute drawing sheet, including Figs. 14 and 15, is included. On the substitute drawing sheet, Figs. 14 and 15 are labeled as "Prior Art." It is believed that the objection to the drawings has been satisfactorily addressed.

Specification Amendments

Paragraph [0007] has been deleted. Furthermore, "Citation 1" and "Citation 2" in Paragraph [0003] have been amended to recite the specific document numbers referred to in deleted Paragraph [0007]. It is believed that the objection to the specification has been satisfactorily addressed.

Amendment to Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the subject matter recited therein over the cited reference to Bretaudeau et al. (USP 5,269,498). In particular, claim 1 is amended to clarify that the pair of restricting projections are arranged to be spaced away from both of the elastic body and the second mounting member. This clarifies that the restricting projections located in the intermediate portion between the elastic body and the second mounting member, which are opposed to each other in the generally radial direction, are spaced away from the opposed elastic body and the cylindrical portion of the second mounting member. A basis for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 7, paragraphs [0013] and [0048] of the specification.

As a result, the deformation of the restricting projections is facilitated, promoting disturbance of flows of the fluid through the annular region that may cause undesirable resonance effect. This is discussed below in detail.

Additionally, claim 1 is amended to correct minor informalities contained therein as suggested by the Examiner.

Obviousness Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretaudeau et al ('498). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretaudeau et al ('498) in view of Okanaka ('458). Further, Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretaudeau et al ('498) in view of Nanno or Ikeda. These rejections, as applied to claim 1 amended as discussed above and claims depending from claim 1, are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner concedes that Bretaudeau et al ('498) lacks the projections 13, 14 or elements 19 being "bonded to" the partition member 5, but notes that column 5, lines 8-12, discloses the blocks 18 can be integrally molded with the elastic body 3 along with filler weights 19. The Examiner contends that, since the filler weights 19 appear to function as applicant's projections, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have "bonded" the elements 13, 14 or 19 in the different embodiments either directly or indirectly (through the elastic element 3) to the partition member 5, to positively secure these elements within the mount or simply to limit fluid communication throughout portions of the mount dependent upon the damping characteristics desired.

However, Bretaudeau et al ('498) discloses that the obstacles immersed in the liquid L must brake both radial and circumferential components in the liquid flow (see column 3 lines 64-66). To meet this end, the obstacle has the overall outside shape that is substantially complementary to the shape of the trough 12 so that it can be received therein in substantial contact with the trough 12 (see column 4, lines 12-16).

To the contrary, the subject matter recited in the claims relates to a suspension-type fluid-filled elastic mount, in which there is provided a pair of restricting projections disposed between the elastic body and the cylindrical portion of the second mounting member. This pair of restricting projections are made easily deformable due to flows of the fluid. This makes it possible to disturb the flow of the fluid, thereby shifting resonance frequency of the fluid flowing through the annular region to a more lower frequency range which does not matter in terms of a vibration-damping capability of the elastic mount (see paragraphs [0011] and [0013] of the specification).

It should be appreciated that, to function as intended, the pair of restricting projections are spaced away from both of the elastic mount and the second mounting member 14. Thus, the pair of restricting projections are fixedly bonded at their proximal ends to the partition member to project into the pressure receiving chamber. This arrangement makes the restricting projections readily elastically deformable, thereby effectively exciting disturbance of flow of the fluid through the annular region.

Bretaudeau et al. ('498), however, fails to disclose or suggest the pair of restricting projections spaced away from both of the elastic body and the cylindrical portion of the second mounting member. Namely, the finned blocks 13, 14 or elements 19 which are interpreted as the restricting projections by the Examiner, are received or connected in the annular trough 12 (i.e., the annular region) with substantially uninterrupted contact therewith (see column 4, lines 12-15). As pointed out by the Examiner, these elements 13, 14, 19 may be formed integrally with the rubber elastic body 3 (see column 5, lines 8-12). This teaches away from the subject matter recited in claim 1.

Since the finned blocks 13, 14 and elements 19 are received in the annular trough 12 in contact therewith, the elastic deformation of the finned blocks 13, 14 and elements 19 are

restricted by the elastic body 3 and the cylindrical portion of the second mounting member 1, making it impossible for the finned blocks 13, 14 to be readily flexibly deformable. Thus, the finned blocks 13, 14 and elements 19 do not provide efficient disturbance of the fluid in comparison with the restricting projection of the elastic mount recited in claim 1.

In addition, as should be apparent from the discussion above, Bretaudeau et al. ('498) is designed to achieve an objective different from that of the recited subject matter, and accordingly lacks essential elements of the recited subject matter, i.e., the pair of restricting projections spaced away from both of the elastic body and the cylindrical portion of the second mounting member. Also, as stated above, Bretaudeau et al. ('498) teaches away from the subject matter recited in claim 1.

As a result, for at least the reasons stated above, the subject matter recited in amended claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor would have been obvious over, Bretaudeau et al. Even if Bretaudeau et al. is considered in combination with other cited references, the combination does not yield the subject matter recited in claim 1. Dependant claims 2-12 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and are therefore also allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons stated for claim 1.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Alan S. Hodes
Reg. No. 38, 185

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300